

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 19-33 are pending in the application, with claims 19, 25 and 31 being the independent claims.

***Examiner Interview***

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephone interview conducted on May 24, 2004. During the interview, independent claim 19 was discussed with respect to the McIntosh patent as applied by the Examiner. The Applicants' representative highlighted distinctions between the McIntosh patent and the claims. Specifically, Applicants' representative noted that the McIntosh patent does not disclose outputting a force based on a selection of the force or a selection of a force profile. Agreement was not reached.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)***

Claims 19-23, 25, 27, 28 and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,103,404 to McIntosh ("the McIntosh patent"). Claim 19 recites "a data storage component configured to store torque data associated with the haptic feedback, the torque data being provided by a host computer based on a selection of at least one force profile from [a] plurality of force profiles." Claim 25 recites "a local data storage component configured to store the plurality of torque data values, the plurality of torque data values being provided by a host computer based on a selection of a force output profile from the plurality of force output profiles." Claim 31 recites "receiving a control signal associated with at least one of an input signal from a computer program, a torque signal data from a local memory device, and the position signal, the torque signal data being provided to the local memory device by a host computer based on a selection of a torque profile associated with the torque signal data."

The McIntosh patent discloses a tactile feedback device for a manipulator, such as a knob. The feedback to the knob can be varied in proportion to certain forces or conditions applied to the knob during its operation. There is no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever in the McIntosh patent regarding outputting a force based on a selection of the force or a selection of a force profile. The forces output by the device in the McIntosh patent are output only in response to forces and conditions applied to the manipulator (i.e., velocity, acceleration, etc.).

The McIntosh patent fails to disclose or suggest “a data storage component configured to store torque data associated with the haptic feedback, the torque data being provided by a host computer based on a selection of at least one force profile from [a] plurality of force profiles” as recited in independent claim 19.

With respect to independent claim 25, the McIntosh patent fails to disclose or suggest “a local data storage component configured to store the plurality of torque data values, the plurality of torque data values being provided by a host computer based on a selection of a force output profile from the plurality of force output profiles.”

Additionally, the McIntosh patent fails to disclose or suggest receiving a “receiving a control signal associated with at least one of an input signal from a computer program, a torque signal data from a local memory device, and the position signal, the torque signal data being provided to the local memory device by a host computer based on a selection of a torque profile associated with the torque signal data” as recited in independent claim 31.

For at least the above reasons, independent claims 19, 25 and 31 are allowable over the McIntosh patent. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 19, 25 or 31, dependent claims 20-23, 27, 28, 30 and 32-33 are also allowable.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)***

Claims 24, 26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the McIntosh patent. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 19 or 25, dependent claims 24, 26 and 28 are also allowable.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that further personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Date: July 7, 2004

By:

  
Erik B. Milch  
Reg. No. 42,887

COOLEY GODWARD LLP  
One Freedom Square  
Reston Town Center  
11951 Freedom Drive  
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656  
(703) 456-8000 – Phone  
(703) 456-8100 – Facsimile